

**REMARKS**

***Status of the Claims***

In the present Amendment, the present claims have been amended for clarification purposes. Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitation “the silver particles of the electrically conductive composition are mutually fused.” Support is found, for example, at page 11, lines 21-24, of the originally filed specification. Claim 1 was also amended to recite that the electrically conductive coating is obtained by coating the electrically conductive paste followed by heating, which was present in the originally filed claims. The claims also recite that the average particle diameter of the particulate silver compound is about 0.01 - 10  $\mu\text{m}$ . Support is found, for example, in the first paragraph on page 5 of the specification. Claim 25 was added. Support is found, for example, in claim 10 of the originally filed application. No new matter has been added, and entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the amendment, claims 1, 4-6, 9, 11-18 and 20-25 will be pending.

***Response to the Examiner’s Section 103 Rejection***

Referring to Paragraph No. 7 at page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4-6, 9, 11-18 and 20-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over USPN 6,951,666 (Kodas) and USPN 5,242,623 (Morrison).

Applicant traverses and respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider in view of the following remarks and the amendments to the claims.

The present claims are patentable over the combination of Kodas and Morrison, at least because Kodas and Morrison fail to disclose an electrically conductive coating, formed by coating and heating the claimed electrically conductive paste, wherein the silver particles of the

coating are mutually fused. Indeed, Kudas and Morrison are completely silent with regard to a electrically conductive coating having mutually fused silver particles.

Furthermore, because the silver particles of the electrically conductive coating are mutually fused, an electrically conductive coating can be obtained with a volume resistivity of approximately  $3.0 \times 10^{-6}$  to  $8.0 \times 10^{-6} \Omega \cdot \text{cm}$ . This level of volume resistivity for an electrically conductive coating is very close to the level of volume resistivity of metallic silver (about  $1.6 \times 10^{-6} \Omega \cdot \text{cm}$ ). (See page 2, lines 21 to 22, of the specification.) In contrast, Applicant submits that the cited art fails to disclose a volume resistivity of an electrically conductive coating that is close to the level of volume resistivity of metallic silver.

Accordingly, the present claims are structurally different from the cited art and, thereby, obtains superior effects that are not disclosed in the cited art.

Newly added claim 25 is patentable over the cited art based on its dependency on claim 1 and the additional elements recited therein.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections based on the combination of Kudas and Morrison are respectfully requested.

### ***Conclusion***

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the local, Washington, D.C., telephone number listed below.

***AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111***

**U.S. Application No.: 10/500,124**

**Attorney Docket No.: Q81414**

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael G. Raucci (61,444)/ for

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

---

Ryan C. Cady  
Registration No. 56,762

Date: September 3, 2009